

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address CCMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Wachington D C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/304,787	05/04/1999	CARL J. EVENS	COS-98-009	1151	
25537	7590 07/11/2002				
WORLDCOM, INC.			EXAMINER		
TECHNOLOG	BY LAW DEPARTMENT REET NW		SOBUTKA	A, PHILIP	
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2683	····-	
			DATE MAILED: 07/11/2002	DATE MAILED: 07/11/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/304,787	EVENS ET AL.	ţ				
A	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Philip J. Sobutka	2683					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 06 June 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any							
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sturs after the maining date of the imarreje	ction, even il timely med,	may reduce any				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7,14-17 and 19-22</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
B. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10. Other:							





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding the use of capcodes are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Taubenheim does not show the use of capcodes, however Taubenheim clearly shows the use of capcodes (Taubenheim col 4, lines 32–45). Applicant alleges that this is only for determining intervals for receiving, however this would clearly be a necessary step for the transmission and receipt of a segment, which in this case would include the claimed advertising script. Therefore the claims do not distinguish over Taubenheim's use of capcodes.

Regarding claim 15, the examiner regrets that the motivation statement was omitted from the previous action. In this case it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Taubenheim to use a plurality of service types including residential, small and large business, as taught by Yeh, in order to allow for each customer category to have their needs more specifically met. Note that since the capcodes would be required for each delivery, of course the capcodes would correspond. The examiner regrets any inconvenience caused by the omission of this motivation statement for the rejection.

Regarding claim 2, the examiner maintains that it is inherent in a paging system that the identification number of a selective calling receiver must be stored in a database, else the system could not possible identify the specific receiver

WILLIAM TROST SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600